

## REMARKS

### 1. Summary of Office Action

In the Office Action mailed March 22, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,766,168) in view of Lindsay et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,729,929). The Lindsay et al. reference is U.S. Patent No. 6,515,970, not U.S. Patent No. 6,729,929. U.S. Patent No. 6,729,929 is by Sayers et al. The Examiner made this Office Action Final.

### 2. Amendments and Pending Claims

Now pending in this application are claims 1-5 of which claim 1 is independent.

### 3. Response to Making the Office Action Final

M.P.E.P. §706.07(b), Form Paragraph 7.42.09, allows for a First Action following Request for Continued Examination under 37 C.F.R. 1.114 to be made Final if all claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to entry of the submission under 37 C.F.R. 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the *next* Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 C.F.R. 1.114. (Emphasis added).

Since no Office Action for this application was mailed prior to the Request for Continued Examination or prior to the mailing of this current Office Action, Applicant submits that the claims of this application could not have been finally rejected in a *next* Office Action. For this reason, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of making this Office Action Final and requests withdrawal of the finality of this Office Action.

#### 4. Response to §103 Rejections

The Examiner indicated that claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim et al. in view of Lindsay et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-5 because the combination of Lim et al. and Lindsay et al. fail to disclose or suggest the combination of elements recited in any of these claims.

With respect to claim 1, Lim et al. and Lindsay et al., alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest (i) *by the OMC, transmitting* BSC ID allocation data *to all the BSCs* coupled to the OMC and allocating corresponding specific BSC identities (IDs) and corresponding group IDs to all BSCs, or (ii) *by each of the plurality of BSCs, receiving* the BSC ID allocation data *from the OMC* and recognizing a corresponding specific BSC ID and a corresponding group ID allocated to each BSC by analyzing the BSC ID allocation data, as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added).

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner indicated that Lim et al. discloses assigning base station controller identities (BSC IDs) with packet zone identifier (PZID)(group ID) and base transceiver station identities (BTS IDs) in an IMT-2000 system. The Examiner also indicated that Lim et al. *does not* expressly disclose receiving BSC IDs and group IDs from an Operating and Maintenance Center (OMC) and BTS IDs from a BSC, but that Lindsay et al. discloses a *general polling message* including a zone field, BSC ID field, and a base ID field. (Emphasis added).

In Lindsay et al., the general poll message is a message that is *sent by a base station to a mobile station*. (See e.g., Figures 4A and 4B, and Col. 10, lines 1-11). (Emphasis added). However, Lindsay et al. does not teach or suggest that the general poll message is sent from an OMC to a plurality of BSCs.

Moreover, according to Lindsay et al., a general poll message includes (i) a zone field that identifies the paging zone of a specific base station, (ii) a BSC ID field that is a sequence uniquely identifying a BSC, and (iii) a base ID field that is a sequence uniquely identifying a base station. (Col. 12, lines 31-35 and 48-55). However, Lindsay et al. does not teach or suggest that the zone field or any other field in the general poll message is a group ID.

Since, as the Examiner indicated, Lim et al. does not disclose receiving BSC IDs and group IDs from an Operating and Maintenance Center (OMC), and since Lim et al. and Lindsay et al., alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest (i) an OMC transmitting BSC ID allocation data to all the BSCs coupled to the OMC and allocating corresponding specific BSC identities (IDs) and corresponding group IDs to all BSCs, or (ii) the plurality of BSCs receiving the BSC ID allocation data from the OMC and recognizing a corresponding specific BSC ID and a corresponding group ID allocated to each BSC by analyzing the BSC ID allocation data, Applicant submits that the combination of Lim et al. and Lindsay et al. fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1.

For these and potentially other reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Lim et al. and Lindsay et al. Further, claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and are also allowable over Lim et al. and Lindsay et al. for at least the reason that they are dependent upon an allowable claim.

**5. Conclusion**

In view of the remarks above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-5 are now in a condition for allowance, and respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims. If the Examiner would like to discuss this case, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (312) 913-2129.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDONNELL BOEHNEN  
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Date: May 18, 2005

By: Richard A. Machonkin  
Richard A. Machonkin  
Reg. No. 41,962